



**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:
COPYRIGHT, TRADE-MARKS, PATENTS (298H1S)**

2003/2004

VOLUME 3: PATENTS

**Abraham Drassinower
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto**

**These materials are solely for the classroom use of students in the Faculty of Law,
University of Toronto**

**INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY:
COPYRIGHT, TRADE-MARKS, PATENTS (298H1S)**

2003/2004

VOLUME 3: PATENTS

**Abraham Drassinower
Faculty of Law
University of Toronto**

**These materials are solely for the classroom use of students in the Faculty of Law,
University of Toronto**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/intellectualprop03dras>

Volume 3

Patents

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Gordon F. Henderson, "An Introduction to Patent Law," in Gordon F. Henderson, ed., *Patent law of Canada* (Scarborough: Carswell, 1994), at 1-14.....1

II. Presumption of Validity

Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....9

III. Novelty

Xerox of Canada Ltd. et al. v. IBM Canada Ltd. (1977), 33 C.P.R. (2d) 24 (F.C.A.).....12
Reeves Brothers Inc. v. Toronto Quilting & Embroidery Ltd. (1978), 43 C.P.R. (2d) 145 (F.C.T.D.).....21
Beloit Canada Ltd. v. Valmet Oy (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 289 (F.C.A.).....25
J.M. Voith GmbH v. Beloit Corp. (1991), 36 C.P.R. (3d) 322 (F.C.A.).....32
Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....44

IV. Obviousness/Inventive Step

Farbwerke Hoescht v. Halocarbon (1979), 42 C.P.R. (2d) 145 (S.C.C.).....51
Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co. (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....61
Beloit Canada Ltd. et al. v. Valmet Oy (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 289 (F.C.A.).....62
Diversified Products Corp. v. Tye-Sil Corp. (1991), 35 C.P.R. (3d) 350 (F.C.A.).....65
General Tire v. Firestone, [1972] R.P.C. 457 (C.A.).....73
Procter & Gamble Co. et al. v. Kimberley-Clark of Canada Ltd. (1991), 40 C.P.R. (3d) 1 (F.C.T.D.).....96
Windsurfing International Inc. v. Tabur Marine (Great Britain) Ltd., [1985] R.P.C. 59 (C.A.).....98
Windsurfing International Inc. et al. v. Trilantic (now Bic Sports Inc.) (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 241 (F.C.A.).....109
Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc. v. Imperial Tobacco Ltd., [1993] F.C.J. No. 135 (F.C.A.).....114

V. Utility

X v. Commissioner of Patents (1981), 59 C.P.R. (2d) 7 (F.C.A.).....134
Minerals Separation North American Corp. v. Noranda Mines Ltd. (1952), 15 C.P.R. 133 (J.C.P.C.).....137
Burton Parsons Chemicals, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard (Canada) Ltd., [1976] 1 S.C.R. 555 (S.C.C.).....142
TRW Inc. v. Walbar of Canada Inc., [1991] F.C.J. No. 1075 (F.C.A.).....149

VI. Subject Matter

Pioneer Hi-Bred Ltd. v. Commissioner of Patents (1987), 14 C.P.R. (3d) 491 (F.C.A.).....151
Pioneer Hi-Bred Ltd. v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents) (1989), 25 C.P.R. 3d 257 (S.C.C.).....155
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. Canada (Commissioner of Patents), [2000] F.C.J. No. 1213 (F.C.A.).....167
Schlumberger Canada Ltd. v. Commissioner of Patents (1982), 56 C.P.R. (2d) 204 (F.C.A.).....208
Tennessee Eastman Co. et al. v. Commissioner of Patents (1973), 8 C.P.R. (2d) 202 (S.C.C.).....210

VII. Sufficiency of the Patent Specification

<i>Consolboard Inc. v. MacMillan Bloedel (Saskatchewan) Ltd.</i> , [1981] 1 S.C.R. 504 (S.C.C.).....	218
<i>Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	229

VIII. Infringement

<i>McPhar Engineering Co. v. Sharpe Instruments</i> (1960), 35 C.P.R. 105 (Ex. Ct.).....	241
<i>Catnic Components Ltd. v. Hill and Smith Ltd.</i> , [1982] R.P.C. 183 (H.L.).....	262
<i>Beecham Canada Ltd. et al. v. Procter & Gamble Co.</i> (1982), 61 C.P.R. (2d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	268
<i>O'Hara Manufacturing Ltd. v. Eli Lilly & Co.</i> (1989), 26 C.P.R. (3d) 1 (F.C.A.).....	272
<i>Mobil Oil Corp. et al. v. Hercules Canada Inc.</i> (1995), 63 C.P.R. (3d) 473 (F.C.A.).....	278
<i>Windsurfing International Inc. et al. v. Trilantic (now Bic Sports Inc.)</i> (1986), 8 C.P.R. (3d) 241 (F.C.A.).....	282
<i>Camco Inc. and General Electric Company v. Whirlpool Corporation and Inglis Ltd.</i> , [2000] 2 S.C.R. 1067, (S.C.C.).....	288
<i>Larami Ltd. v. The Ohio Art Co.</i> , 2003 U.S. Dist. Lexis 11645 (U.S. District Court, NJ)	317